UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/380,864	12/02/1999	MARTYN VINCENT TWIGG	JMYT-V00200	3166

23122 7590 06/02/2004

RATNERPRESTIA
P O BOX 980
VALLEY FORGE, PA 19482-0980

EXAMINER	
LEUNG, JENNIFER A	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1764	

DATE MAILED: 06/02/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/380,864	TWIGG, MARTYN VINCENT	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jennifer A. Leung	1764	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *10 March 2004*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *9-16,18,21-30,32,34 and 35* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *9-16,18,21-30,32,34 and 35* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Applicant's amendment submitted on December 29, 2003 and applicant's supplemental amendment submitted on March 10, 2004 have been received and carefully considered. Claims 1-8, 17, 19, 20, 31 and 33 are cancelled. Claims 9-16, 18, 21-30, 32, 34 and 35 remain active.

Double Patenting

2. Claim 13 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate of claim 12. When two claims in an application are duplicates, it is proper after allowing one claim to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 9-16, 21-30, 34 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Tsuchitani et al. (EP 0 666 099) in view of Remeika et al. (US 4,001,371).

Regarding claims 9, 14, 21, 26, 34 and 35, Tsuchitani et al. discloses a combination of a lean burn engine (i.e., a gasoline or diesel engine, a boiler, etc. that generates exhaust gas under an oxidizing or air-rich atmosphere; page 3, lines 1-33; page 4, lines 1, 2 and 27-35; page 5, lines 23-26) and an emission control system, said emission control system comprising:

a) a lean NO_x catalyst system comprising a platinum group metal (PGM) for

reducing NO_x to N_2, wherein the PGM consists of platinum (page 7, lines 47-55);

b) an oxidation catalyst system comprising a PGM, such as platinum, for oxidizing hydrocarbons and carbon monoxide, disposed downstream from the lean NO_x catalyst system (page 9, lines 38-44); and

c) means for injecting hydrocarbon fuel into the exhaust upstream of the lean NO_x catalyst system (page 5, lines 27-41);

wherein the platinum metal is present in the lean NO_x catalyst system at a loading of less than 30 g/ft^3 (i.e., generally, 0.1 to 30 grams Pt per liter of catalyst, or preferably, 0.5 to 5 grams Pt per liter of catalyst; page 7, line 56 to page 8, line 9).

Additionally, Tsuchitani et al. (page 4, line 6 to page 5, line 14; see claims) discloses a process for controlling the emissions from said lean burn engine, above, said process comprising:

a) passing exhaust gases from the engine over said lean NO_x catalyst system;

b) passing the product gases exiting from the lean NO_x catalyst system over said oxidation catalyst system; and

c) introducing additional hydrocarbon fuel into the exhaust gas upstream of said lean NO_x catalyst system.

With respect to the newly added limitation, Tsuchitani et al. is silent as to the volume of the lean NO_x catalyst system being, specifically, 300 % or greater than that of the volume of the oxidation catalyst system. However, Tsuchitani et al. (page 7, lines 37-46) further discloses,

> "... the space velocity (S.V.) of the exhaust gas under treatment relative to the catalyst bed is preferable to be in the range of 1,000 to 300,000/hr, preferably 10,000 to 200,000/hr. *If the space velocity exceeds 300,000/hr, the catalyst will manifest ample reactivity with difficulty. Conversely, if it falls short of 1,000/hr, the catalyst will have to be increased in volume*, and moreover, the diffusion in the flow path of gas will bring

> about the influence of nullifying the effect of intermittently introducing the reducing substance or imparting a reducing atmosphere to the exhaust gas."

This suggests to one having ordinary skill in the art of catalysis that the activity or reaction rate as exhibited by a given catalyst system is a function of the parameters of space velocity and catalyst volume, among other variables, wherein decreasing space velocity or increasing catalyst volume produces the same effect. Thus, in order to maximize the activity or reaction rate of a given catalyst system, the space velocity in the system should be decreased, or conversely, the catalyst volume in the system should be increased, within economical limits.

The reference of Remeika et al. further evidences this trend. In particular, Remeika et al., (column 7, lines 24-39) teaches,

> "While total reaction rate may not be linearly related to surface area, particularly as total conversion is approached, *it is apparent that significant improvement will result from increasing this parameter*. Space velocities have, in general, been of a level utilized by commercial developers of exhaust catalysts. *Decreasing space velocity is generally equivalent to increasing surface area; and it is, therefore, apparent that a decrease in velocity will also result in increased catalytic activity*. Both trends have been experimentally verified with the compositions of the invention. Accordingly, 100 percent conversion or nearly 100 percent conversion of NO_x with but a small content of NH_3 in the effluent will result either upon decrease in volume flow rate or upon increase in active catalysts surface area."

From the teachings above, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to select an appropriate volume for the lean NO_x catalyst system relative to the oxidation catalyst system in the process and apparatus of Tsuchitani et al., on the basis of suitability for the intended use and absent showing any unexpected results thereof, since the volume ratio of the lean NO_x catalyst system to the oxidation catalyst system would have been considered a result effective variable by one having ordinary skill in the art,

and accordingly, one having ordinary skill in the art would have routinely optimized the volume of catalyst in the lean NO_x catalyst system in relation to the oxidation catalyst system to obtain a desired total conversion of NO_x in the lean NO_x catalyst system and HC/CO in the oxidation catalyst system. *In re Boesch*, 617 F.2d. 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980). Also, it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering optimum or workable ranges involves routine skill in the art. *In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233.

Regarding claims 10, 11, 22 and 23, Tsuchitani et al. is silent as to whether the NO_x catalyst has an activity sufficient to provide a ratio of % NO_x to % HC conversion of at least 0.2, or whether the oxidation catalyst has an activity sufficient to provide a % HC conversion greater than 80% and a % CO conversion greater than 70%, as measured under the testing conditions of 230 °C, a space velocity of 25,000 hr^{-1} and a HC:NO_x input ratio of 3:1 counting the HC as equivalent propane. In any event, the system and method of Tsuchitani et al. meet the claims, since although the instantly claimed conversion rates for the given testing conditions are not specifically disclosed, a newly discovered property does not necessarily mean the product is unobvious, since this property may be inherent in the prior art. *In re Best 195 USPQ 430 (CCPA 1977); In re Swinehart 169 USPQ 226 (CCPA 1971).* The system and process as disclosed by Tsuchitani et al. substantially comprises the elements of the instantly claimed invention and therefore one of ordinary skill in the art would not expect a different and/or unexpected result to be obtained. Furthermore, it would have been an obvious design choice for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to select an appropriate temperature, space velocity and input ratio for the catalyst system evaluation on the basis of suitability for the intended use, since what is recited is merely a testing condition, and where the general conditions of a claim

are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art, *In re Aller, 105 USPQ 233*.

Regarding claims 12, 13 and 24, Tsuchitani et al. discloses the lean NOx catalyst system may further comprise an alkaline earth metal (i.e., beryllium, magnesium, calcium, strontium barium, or a compound of the metal; page 7, lines 47-55).

Regarding claims 15 and 27, Tsuchitani et al. discloses the oxidation catalyst system PGM loading is about 100 g/ft^3 (i.e., "... the noble metal to be preferable is desired to be in the range of 0.1 to 5 g per liter of the catalyst," page 9, line 55 to page 10, line 19).

Regarding claims 16 and 28, Tsuchitani et al. discloses the oxidation or lean NO_x catalyst system further comprise alumina, ceria or zirconia (page 8, line 33 to page 9, line 1).

Regarding claim 25, Tsuchitani et al. discloses the oxidation catalyst system further comprises a base metal (i.e., iron, nickel; page 9, line 55 to page 10, line 19).

Regarding claim 29 and 30, Tsuchitani et al. (page 7, lines 37-46) discloses,

> "... the space velocity (S.V.) of the exhaust gas under treatment relative to the catalyst bed is preferable to be in the range of 1,000 to 300,000/hr, preferably 10,000 to 200,000/hr. If the space velocity exceeds 300,000/hr, the catalyst will manifest ample reactivity with difficulty. Conversely, if it falls short of 1,000/hr, the catalyst will have to be increased in volume, and moreover, the diffusion in the flow path of gas will bring about the influence of nullifying the effect of intermittently introducing the reducing substance or imparting a reducing atmosphere to the exhaust gas."

Accordingly, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to select the recited space velocities in the method of Tsuchitani et al., because the specific space velocities would have been considered a result effective variable, and one having ordinary skill in the art would have routinely optimized the space velocity for each of the lean NO_x catalyst system and oxidation catalyst system on the basis of the desired catalytic

activity, catalyst volume, volumetric gas flow, etc. *In re Boesch*, 617 F.2d. 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980). Furthermore, it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233.

4. Claims 18 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Tsuchitani et al. (EP 0 666 099) in view of Fukui et al. (U.S. 5,474,745).

Tsuchitani et al. is silent as to providing the lean NOx catalyst system as two catalytic substrates arranged in parallel. Fukui et al. teach an apparatus for reducing NO_x in exhaust gas from a diesel engine comprising an NO_x reducing catalyst coated on two substrates arranged in parallel (FIG. 15; column 11, lines 34-44). It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to configure the NO_x catalyst as such in the system and process of Tsuchitani et al. because such arrangement improves the heat release ability of the substrate in comparison to a larger converter, as taught by Fukui et al. "In order to increase the conversion efficiency for reducing NO_x in the exhaust gas... it is important to keep temperatures of the gas and catalyst from increasing by releasing the exothermic heat to the outside immediately," (column 4, lines 3-11).

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's amendments and corresponding arguments filed on December 29, 2003 and March 10, 2004, with respect to the rejection of claims 9-16, 18, 21-30, 32, 34 and 35 have been fully considered. In view of the newly added limitations, said rejections have been withdrawn. However, upon further search, new grounds of rejection are made in view of the newly found prior art reference(s), above.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

Chen et al. (previously cited during prosecution) further illustrates the relationship between increasing catalytic activity and decreasing space velocity or increasing catalyst volume, as it applies to claims 1, 21 and 34 above. The system of Chen et al. comprises a first upstream catalyst bed for selectively reacting non-halogenated compounds and a second downstream catalyst bed for selectively reacting halogenated organic compounds. Chen et al. (column 13, lines 9-40) teaches,

> "For a fixed flow rate, the VHSV can be controlled by adjusting the size of the catalyst bed."
>
> "The bed volume and loading levels of the catalytic components may be specifically sized and tailored to particular applications. In dual bed configurations, the relative bed volume and catalytically active metal loading levels of the first and second catalyst beds may be varied according to the specific conversion requirements of the treatment application. For example, a dual bed device may have a relatively larger volume of the second catalyst than the first catalyst when it is desired to have a very high destruction efficiency [within the second catalyst]; whereas a device providing high efficiency [within the first catalyst] and lesser efficiency [within the second catalyst] may require a larger volume of the first catalyst and a smaller bed volume of the second catalyst."

* * *

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a). A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from

the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

* * *

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jennifer A. Leung whose telephone number is (571) 272-1449. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 am - 5:30 pm M-F, every other Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenn A. Caldarola can be reached on (571) 272-1444. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Jennifer A. Leung
May 25, 2004

Hien Tran

HIEN TRAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER